DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 892 CE 045 504

AUTHOR Hotchkiss, Lawrence
TITLE Post High School Labor Market Outcomes and Schooling.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ancillary School Services; *Behavior Problems; Career Education; Counselor Attitudes; Educational Research; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Experience; Employment Patterns; *High School Graduates; *Labor Market; *Outcomes of Education; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Unemployment; Work Attitudes; Youth

ABSTRACT

The effects of four types of variables on employment experience in the period immediately after leaving high school were examined. These four types of variables were deviance in high school, respondent attitudes measured during the senior year in high school, school services, and school staff attitudes on employment experience in the immediate time periods after leaving high school. Data from the High School and Beyond (HSB) survey and a supplemental survey of school staff from HSB schools were used in the analyses. Findings indicated deviance during high school had small or nonexistent effects on employment experience just after leaving high school. Attitudes had stronger effects than deviance. Internal locus of control and strong family values led to favorable labor market outcomes. Positive self-esteem hindered labor market success. Work values had almost no effects. These results suggested that employer emphasis on good attitudes and hard work is misplaced. The investigation of school variables did not uncover any exceptionally strong effects. Strongest effects were for job information; counseling services did not show a consistent pattern of helping youth in the school-to-work transition. Staff emphasis on the importance of job skills and basic skills increased unemployment. A 35-item reference list and four data tables are appended. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275892

POST HIGH SCHOOL LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES AND SCHOOLING

Lawrence Hotchkiss

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Hotchkiss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE045504

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

1984

*Paper read at the 1986 annual meetings of The American Educational Research Association

POST HIGH SCHOOL LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES AND SCHOOLING

Introduction

The labor market faced by youth immediately after leaving high school comprises a very special context, in contrast to the job and wage structures in the broader market for all adults (Freeman and Wise 1982; Hollingshead 1975). A composite of the employment experience of typical youth just after leaving high school is as follows: youth tend to take jobs with wages at or near the minimum, jobs that require little training, jobs with little chance for advancement, and jobs with little or no job security. In short, jobs in the "secondary labor market" (Doeringer and Piore 1971; Hodson and Kaufman 1982). Further, individual job attachment is low and youth shift jobs in a seemingly capricious fashion (Osterman 1980). At least some of these features of the youth labor market and the behavior of young workers have been known, or at least believed, for many decades. Wilms (1983), for example, cites opinions on the youth labor market that are similar to the description just given and that date back before 1910.

The empirical record regarding factors that affect entry-level employment experiences does not yield a clear picture. Kang (1984) and Kang and Bishop (1984) find that basic skills do not affect wage and hours, but vocational courses, good grades in vocational courses, and internal "locus of control" do have positive effects. Findings that vocational study has strong positive effects on early labor market experience have not been reported consistently, however, but some generalizations appear to have emerged in recent work. The most consistent finding is that young women with business and office skills earn more than noncollege women without such training (Campbell et al. 1982; Rumberger and Daymont 1982; Mertens and Gardner 1981; Grasso and Shea 1979). Also, vocational courses apparently are beneficial if

the job one gets is related to the training (Rumberger and Daymont 1982; Campbell, Basinger, Dauner, and Parks 1986).

Another consistent finding is that working part-time during high school contributes to earnings after leaving high school (Stephenson 1981; D'Amico and Baker 1984; Ellwood 1981; Mortimer and Finch forthcoming; Meyer and Wise 1982). Finally, race and sex differences in employment outcomes are strong (Freeman and Wise 1982). Wage differences by race have declined in recent years (Shapiro 1984), but large racial differences in unemployment rates persist (Young 1982). Wage differences by gender are especially strong and appear to remain even within occupation (Treiman and Hartman 1981).

Empirical research generally has not focused on misbehavior and attitudes as determinants of labor market experience, yet employers frequently emphasize these characteristics. Surveys often find that employers consider dependability to be the most important characteristic of a new hire. Since training requirements are limited and tend to be firm-specific, willingness to work hard is the key ingredient (Wilms 1983, 1984; Lester 1954; Hollenbeck and Smith 1984). Other scholars have made similar claims on a priori grounds (DiPrete 1981; Bowles and Gintes 1976). Wilms (1983) gives the following characterizations:

> A majority of employers (63 percent) regarded good work habits and positive attitudes as crucial to an employee's success on the job. These attributes--typically defined as 'following the rules and working hard'--were considered especially important in entry-level jobs that require only a short vocational preparation time for the average worker to become productive. When asked to describe successful entry-level employees, 97 percent mentioned those who were

hard working and reliable, rather than those with special skills (p. 2).

Hollenbeck and Smith (1984) conducted interviews with employer representatives as part of their study of factors influencing hiring decisions of employers of young workers. They summarize their findings in the following terms:

> A large percentage of employers making comments about their experiences with young workers in entry-level jobs expressed concerns over the poor attitudes exhibited by young people while at work. These comments included references to poor employee work habits, motivation, and responsibility. These characteristics include problems with workmanship, customer interaction, absenteeism, and tardiness (p. 75).

Of course, other characteristics also are mentioned by employers, the most common being proficiency in basic skills and communications (Wilms 1983). Vocational training is not often cited, and is not preferred over other types of secondary school study.

Revisionist critics of the function of schooling in society also imply that behavior and attitudes have an important bearing on labor market outcomes. They claim that schools prepare lower class youth for lower class jobs and middle and upper class youth for jobs corresponding to their status orgins (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Carnoy and Levin 1976). A fundamental point in this argument is that schools encourage students of lower class origin to be compliant and to expect to work hard in "mindless" jobs. In contrast, middle and upper class students are taught to think for themselves in preparation for high-status, challenging jobs. An important link implied by this viewpoint is that compliant attitudes and behaviors learned in school

will pay off in the secondary labor market faced by youth just after finishing high school, particularly for youth who do not attend college.

This paper complements past research on determinants of early labor market experience by focusing on the effects of misbehavior learned in school and attitudes measured while still in school. The paper also examines effects of school characteristics and staff attitudes on early labor market outcomes. Data from the High School and Beyond (HSB) and a special supplemental survey of school staff from HSB schools are used in the analyses. The research reported here is a continuation of work on the employability-development function of schooling supported by the National Institute of Education and conducted at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Past research at the National Center investigated impacts of differences among schools on in-school outcomes such as test scores, attitudes, deportment, and career plans (Hotchkiss 1984; Hotchkiss, Kang, and Bishop 1984; Hotchkiss and Dorsten 1985). In the context of employability development, however, the ultimate criteria must consist of labor market outcomes after leaving high school. There are two important respects in which examination of schooling effects on student knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors measured while the youth remain in high school may yield an incomplete picture of the employability enhancement function of schools. First, the individual outcomes measured during high school may not have the presumed effects on labor market experience after leaving high school. Second, the goals, organization, and function of high schools may contribute to the employment prospects of former students in ways that do not operate by changing the "employability profiles" of their students. Examples of this type of school effect include linkages to employers, provision of job information,

and operation of a job placement service. The work reported here speaks to both of these points.

Analysis and Variables

The analysis proceeds in two parts. First, we examine the effects of (1) deportment in high school and (2) a set of five attitudes measured during the last year of high school on wage, hours, and unemployment during the first two years following high school. Three direct measures of conformity to school norms are used in this analysis—days absent from school but not sick in the first half of the senior year, days tardy to school in the first half of the senior year, and cutting class "now and then" (yes or no). A dummy variable indicating whether one received a high school diploma or GED also is included. In addition, three variables indicating having been sanctioned for some unknown infraction(s) are part of the analysis. These three variables are having "discipline problems in school," having been suspended from school, and having been "in serious trouble with the law." Labeling theory (Becker 1963) suggests that these types of experiences tend to encourage a pattern of persistent deviance.

There are two primary mechanisms by which deviance in high school might affect employment outcomes later. First, employers might select new hires for entry-level positions in part on the basis of applicants' behavior in high school. Since accurate information about such behavior may be difficult to obtain, one might expect public sanctions to have stronger negative impacts on employment than the more direct measures of behavior. The second mechanism operates by indirection. It is based on the assumption that deviant behavior is persistent across time and setting. The hypothesis is that breach of high school norms will tend to foster violation of work norms on the job. Failure to conform on the job will tend to retard wage growth,

reduce work hours, and increase the likelihood of unemployment. These mechanisms are shown graphically in figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Model of the impact of deviance on work experiences.

We have no measure of deviance on the job; hence, the analyses conducted here will estimate the total effects of high school deviance (a + bc). Since it is much easier to learn about sanctions for deviance than about deviant behavior, it is likely that the direct effect of high school sanctions are greater than the direct effects of deviance. Hence, one might expect larger total effects for disciplinary problems in school, suspension, and trouble with the law than for absence, tardiness, and class cutting. Further, behavior that leads to sanctions, particularly suspension or being in trouble with the law, may be perceived by employers to be relatively serious. For this reason also one is led a priori to expect stronger effects of the sanctioned behavior than of the direct measures of deviance. Failure to obtain a high school diploma is easy to observe; hence, its direct effect through employer selectivity also should be relatively strong.

Effects of attitudes such as work orientation, if they affect employment outcomes, presumably operate through their impact on behavior at work. The argument relating to effects of attitudes thus parallels that for deviance. The search for effects of attitudes is stimulated by the presumption that

attitudes measured in high school are stable. They persist into the years following high school and affect behavior at work. But their effects should be broader than the effects of deviance. Attitudes should affect performance characteristics by influencing effort, initiative, and insight on the job, as well as by influencing deviance on the job.

An attitude with apparent relevance to behavior at work is a measure of work values, or work orientation. A scale of work values consisting of four items is included as an independent variable predicting wage and employment outcomes. Additionally, a scale of family values, a scale of community values, a scale of self-esteem, and a scale of locus of control are included in the set of attitudinal predictor variables. The scales and the items that measure them are as follows:

- o Work values—
  - Importance of being successful in one's work
  - Importance of finding steady work
  - Importance of having lots of money
  - Importance of leisure (reflected)
- o Family values—
  - Importance of a happy family life
  - Importance of providing a "better life" for one's child
  - Importance of living close to one's parents
  - Importance of moving away from one's hometown (reflected)
  - Importance of having children
- o Community Values—
  - Importance of being a leader in one's community
  - Importance of giving one's children improved opportunities
  - Importance of seeking to correct inequalities

o Self-esteem—

- Taking a positive attitude toward oneself
- Belief that one is "of equal worth" (to the next person)
- Belief that one can do things as well as others
- Satisfaction with oneself
- Agreement that one is "no good" (reflected)
- Agreement that one is not proud of oneself (reflected)

o Locus of control—

- Importance of good luck rather than hard work (reflected)
- Belief that somebody gets in the way of success (reflected)
- Belief that it doesn't pay to plan ahead (reflected)
- Belief that people should accept conditions as they are (reflected)
- Belief that what happens to one is one's own doing
- Belief that one's plans usually work

Response options for each of these items were as follows: "not important" (scored 1), "somewhat important" (scored 2), and "very important" (scored 3). The items appearing below each construct were averaged to produce the indexes. Prior to calculating each average, items indicated as reflected were subtracted from 4, thus changing the direction of the scoring.

Little research has been conducted with these attitudinal measures, but Andrisani (1978) and Kang (1984) do find that internal locus of control contributes to desirable labor market outcomes. Kang, however, finds hours effects of locus of control but no wage effects. Andrisani summarizes a theoretical argument suggesting that internal locus of control influences labor market experience because it influences initiative. Those with internal locus, it is argued, take more initiatives. A similar argument applies to self-esteem (Bachman and O'Malley 1977). Therefore, those with internal

locus of control and high self-esteem should earn more and achieve higher prestige occupations. Family and community values are hypothesized to affect employment because they are associated with "responsible" behavior generally, and the tendency to be responsible probably extends into the work place.

The second aspect of the analysis consists of examining the effects of school-staff characteristics and school services on employment experience of youth just after leaving high school. Measures of these staff characteristics were derived from the principal, teacher, guidance, and vocational questionnaire data which is part of the supplemental HSB survey (see below). A total of ten variables were constructed by combining items from these four questionnaires in the Supplemental Survey. Responses of up to 30 teachers per school were averaged for each school before they were combined with items from the other three questionnaires. The ten variables and their definitions are given below.

- o Importance of good work habits--the average rank of the importance of good work habits given by the respondent to the vocational questionnaire, the principal questionnaire, and the teacher questionnaire. The items in each of the three questionnaires appeared as goals to be ranked in order of importance. No work habits option was included on the guidance questionnaire.
- o Importance of schools providing specific job skills--the average rank given across all four Supplemental Survey questionnaires to the importance of teaching students specific job competencies/skills.

- Staff perceptions of student abilities—average across the four questionnaires of respondent's assessment of the capacity of his or her students to learn. These items are derived from the literature on effective schools, where it is argued that teacher belief in the ability of students to learn is critical (Edmonds 1979).
- Release time given to vocational teachers to visit local employers on behalf of students. This variable is defined as the product of number of teachers given release time by the average number of hours per week.
- Linkage to local employers—an average of the following 13 items: percentage of coop coordinator's time spent conferring with employees, percentage of coop coordinator's time spent in site visits, the number of teachers given release time to visit local employers on students' behalf, the average number of hours per week of such visits, whether employers influence the grades of students with supervised work experience, percentage of that grade determined by employers, number of students who participate in apprenticeships for which they receive high school credit, number of high school credits that can be applied to apprenticeship programs, number of career days per year, whether the vocational program has an advisory panel, average hours/week teachers report spent in contacting employers on students' behalf (teacher questionnaire), number of times per year a "typical" member of the guidance staff meets with employers (guidance questionnaire), and number of times per year a typical member of the guidance staff meets with community agencies such

as the Chamber of Commerce (guidance questionnaire). Except as noted, these items came from the vocational questionnaire.

- Placement activities of the school staff--average of five items: whether a placement service exists in the high school, percentage of time staff in the placement service spent finding jobs for graduates of the school, rank order of the importance of the school placement service in finding jobs for graduates of the school (out of a list including the individual student and other school staff), hours per week spent by teachers finding jobs for their students or former students (teacher questionnaire), and percentage of typical vocational teachers' time spent finding jobs for students about to graduate. Except as noted, these items came from the vocational questionnaire.
- Primary guidance services utilization--an index of four components considered by guidance professionals to comprise the primary services offered by school guidance programs: student exposure to career information courses, student exposure to career units in other courses, student use of individual counseling services, and student use of group counseling services. All four variables were defined from the guidance questionnaire by taking the product of the number of students exposed by a rough estimate of the extent of exposure.
- Secondary guidance services--an index of 15 items considered by guidance professionals to be important modes of delivery of guidance services, but not as important as the primary services. Examples include career days, tours of colleges, tours of local employers, and assemblies on vocational topics.

Three labor market outcomes are examined in the analyses: (1) hours worked per week, (2) wage, and (3) unemployment (number of months as percentage of total). Each of these variables is defined for two time periods from event-history data. The first time period is from the first September after the end of the cohort's senior year in high school through the following August (9/80-8/81). The second time period extends from 9/81 to the time of the first follow-up (2/82). The summer months after high school graduation are excluded in order to allow a short period for new graduates to get established either in school or in a job. Dividing the short period after 9/80 into two time periods is done to allow assessment of effects immediately after leaving school and compare those to effects in the later period. Presumably, school variables will have the strongest impact in the most immediate time period.

Data

The data used in this paper are part of the High School and Beyond (HSB) data base. The HSB survey was sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics, and the data collection was carried out by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). Base year data were collected in 1980, the first follow-up was completed in 1982, and the second follow-up was conducted in 1984. Plans call for additional follow-ups at 2-year intervals. The base year survey contains data describing over 58,000 student respondents, split between students who were sophomores (N = 30,030) in 1980 and those who were seniors (N = 28,240) in 1980. All members of the base year sophomore cohort were included in the target sample for the first follow-up, but only about 13,000 of the senior cohort were included.

Students in the sample completed questionnaires at each wave of data collection. The base year questionnaires requested information about respondents' background, personal characteristics, school experiences, career aspirations, attitudes toward work, part-time work during high school, and a number of other topics. The first follow-up for the younger cohort repeated most of the questions in the base year questionnaire, thus permitting extensive analysis of change. The first and second follow-ups of the older cohort and second follow-up of the younger cohort requested detailed information regarding work, family formation, education, military service, and attitudes. A school questionnaire was completed by the principal or other administrator as part of the base year data collection. In addition to the student questionnaire data, a number of other types of data were collected, including standardized tests administered especially for the HSB survey. (See Jones et al. 1983 and Frankel et al. 1981 for more detail).

In addition to the primary HSB data just described, five research institutions formed a consortium to collect supplemental data from principals, teachers and other staff in approximately half of the original HSB schools.[1] Members of the consortium shared expenses of a subcontract with NORC to collect the data, cooperated in constructing the survey questionnaires, and divided the work of data preparation. Data collection for the Supplemental Survey occurred in the Spring of 1984. It would have been preferable to have coordinated the timing of this data collection with that of the first follow-up HSB survey, in order to describe schools during the time period in which respondents were in attendance. The generally slow pace of change in institutions such as schools, however, suggests that the timing of the Supplemental Survey is not a serious enough problem to distort the major relationships. Of course, only a replication with data from another

data set in which the staff questionnaires are administered during the base year data collection can resolve the issue raised by the timing of the Supplemental Survey. Until such data are collected, it is hoped that some useful insights may be gained from the present data.

Five questionnaires were prepared for the Supplemental HSB survey, one corresponding to each of five types of respondents: high school principal, teachers, vocational coordinator, head of guidance, and community service coordinator. Up to 30 teachers in each school responded to the teacher questionnaire; only one respondent per school completed each of the other questionnaires. (See Jones, Knight, and Ingels 1984 for more detail on the Supplemental Data collection).

This chapter makes use of the base-year and first follow-up questionnaire data on the older cohort (1980 seniors), base-year test scores, base year principal data from the main HSB survey, and information from the principal, teacher, guidance and vocational questionnaires associated with the Supplemental Survey. Data from the principal, teacher, guidance, and vocational questionnaires of the Supplemental Survey and the principal questionnaire of the main survey were merged with student data such that each student (up to 36) in a given school was assigned the same value on all variables taken from those questionnaires. Information from the teacher questionnaire was averaged for each school prior to the merge. All cases in which the respondent did not participate in both the base-year and first follow-up surveys were excluded from the analyses. The resulting sample size, excluding the supplemental data, is 10,126, which is 36 percent of the 28,240 members of the base-year older-cohort sample. With the supplemental data included, the sample size is reduced to a maximum of 5,041 (18 percent of original total).

Since the Supplemental Survey included only about half of the original HSB schools, the sample size when variables from the Supplemental Survey are included is cut approximately in half. To conserve cases, analyses of the effects of school deviance and attitudes are conducted without the variables from the Supplemental Survey.

All the analyses include controls for race, ethnicity, and gender (where separate analyses for males and females are not reported), an index of parental status (education, occupation, income); residence in a rural/urban location (two dummies, suburban omitted), age, whether respondent is on active duty in the military, homework, part-time work during high school, math and verbal test scores, grade point average (self-report), grades in business, and grades in trade and industry classes. Initially, analyses were carried out with a more extensive set of controls than were included in the final calculations, including eight dummy variables for census regions, separate parental status measures, and exposure to vocational and academic coursework. Since most of these had negligible coefficients, they were deleted to conserve degrees of freedom.

Results

Since the labor market faced by college students is similar to that faced by nonstudents just out of high school, the two groups are combined for the initial regressions. Males and females also are combined for the initial analyses, with a sex dummy variable included on the right. The estimates are shown in table 1. Effect estimates of seven aspects of school deviance and five attitudinal measures are tabulated. The results are remarkable for the absence of consistent effects of the school behaviors. Only one coefficient out of 42 estimated is statistically significant—the effect of days tardy to

school on wage in period 1 (9/80-8/81). The sign of this coefficient, however, is positive, implying that tardiness in high school raises one's wages after leaving high school. According to the estimate, each day tardy (in the first half of the senior year) adds four cents an hour to the wage later. Even disregarding statistical significance, no clear pattern of effects emerges from inspecting the signs of the coefficients. Most of the coefficients are so small as to be entirely trivial. If there is any generalization in these data, it is that misbehavior in school has a very slight tendency to improve one's labor market experience in the initial two time periods after leaving school. This generalization is weak, however, since the signs of the coefficients exhibit an erratic pattern, and all the coefficients are small. In any case, the results do not support the view that good behavior learned in school is crucial to success of entry-level workers.

Table 1 goes here

The estimated effects of the attitudinal measures are somewhat stronger than the effects of school behaviors, though the effects of the attitudes are not exceptionally strong either. The most curious pattern in these coefficients is that the index of work values does not have a statistically significant effect on any of the six outcomes, and all those coefficients are trivially small in magnitude. In contrast, emphasis on the importance of family (family values), is associated with favorable labor market experience --more hours, higher wage, and less unemployment. The signs of the coefficients on family values are consistent in both time periods, and all three coefficients in period 2 are significant. Only the coefficient on hours is

statistically significant in period 1, however. The signs of the coefficients associated with locus of control are, without exception, consistent with the view that internal locus of control improves early employment experience. Only the coefficients on period 1 wage and period 2 unemployment are significant, however. It is indeed interesting that high self-esteem is associated with poor employment experience in the first two periods after leaving high school. Again, not all the coefficients are statistically significant, but the pattern is unbroken. High self-esteem decreases hours and wage and increases the chance of unemployment. This finding seems to be consistent with the primary emphasis of the revisionist critics of schooling. The same pattern occurs for community values, but the magnitudes of the coefficients is smaller.

By way of brief synopsis, table 1 implies that deviant behavior in high school has practically no influence on entry-level job outcomes. Even presence or absence of a high school diploma has little effect for those who remained in school into grade 12. Neither do work values have any substantial effect. The results do imply that if one desires success in entry-level jobs one should develop low self-esteem, have strong commitment to family, have a weak commitment to community, and believe that one controls one's own destiny. Though the analyses supporting this generalization are not strong, there are no exceptions in the patterns.

Since time is a limited resource, attending a postsecondary school (including colleges and universities) should tend to reduce commitment to the labor market and the hours per week that one works. Moreover, the nature of the market faced by nonstudents who are full-time workers may be different than that faced by students, although informal observation does not suggest

strong differences. Because of these considerations, the regressions reported in table 1 were repeated for full-time students and for those who were not full time students. The results are reported in table 2. No dramatic differences between the estimates in table 1 and those in table 2 are evident, but some discrepancies are noteworthy. First, despite the reduced sample size, some of the effect estimates associated with deviance while in high school are now statistically significant. The strongest effect is on having been in trouble with the law. It reduces hours worked per week in period 1 for college students by nearly five hours per week. Anomalously, however, it raises hours in period 2, and the coefficient is nearly significant ($p \leq .0990$). According to the estimates, absence from high school when not sick raises the wage in period 2 for postsecondary students, and tardiness does so in period 1. For nonstudents, absence in high school raises the chance of unemployment in period 1 but has essentially no effect in period 2. Tardiness raises the chance of unemployment in period 2 but has virtually no effect in period 1. Cutting classes increases hours in period 2 and exhibits a similar tendency in period 1, though the latter coefficient is not significant. Having a high school diploma reduces unemployment in period 2, but not in period 1 (the sign is positive in period 1). Suspension from high school increases unemployment in period 2, but not in period 1. For nonstudents, there does appear to be a weak tendency for effects of "misbehavior" in high school on employment variables to increase from period 1 to period 2. It remains unclear as to whether high school misbehavior improves or is detrimental to post high school employment outcomes, however. In a number of instances, the signs of coefficients are consistent with the view that deviance in high school improves employment outcomes. Cutting classes, for

nonstudents, for example, increases hours in period 2, and the effect is significant and relatively strong.

Table 2 goes here

The patterns of coefficients associated with the attitude variables observed in table 1 is not changed much in table 2, but it is not quite as clear cut, perhaps due to reduced sampling stability. Self-esteem still has a slight negative impact on hours and wage and a positive effect on unemployment. This pattern is clearer among students than among nonstudents. Effects of locus of control remain for nonstudents, but are not so clear for students. Similarly, the effects of family values are stronger for nonstudents. Work values still do not have any noteworthy impact. The effects of community values remain weak, except on unemployment of students in period 1.

Women undoubtedly face a different labor market than men. Consistent tendencies to occupational sex segregation are reported in the literature (e.g., Treiman and Hartman 1981: England 1982). Consequently, the above analyses also were conducted separately for males and females. Effect estimates by gender are reported in table 3. Again, having examined the combined estimates in table 1, there are no major surprises in these data. Differences between the sexes do, however, emerge. First, there are no significant effects of deviance for males, but some strong effects are present for females. The most noteworthy case in point is the strong effect of high school graduation on hours of females in period 2 (but not period 1). Failure to graduate reduces the work time of females in period 2 by 9.5 hours per week. Graduation also helps to reduce unemployment of females in period 2--by 4.2 percent. Absence from school when not sick increases unemployment

in period 1, but not period 2, for females. Curiously, absence is estimated to improve the wages in period 2 for females.

Table 3 goes here

The patterns of effects of attitudes observed in table 1 also are evident in table 3, but the clarity is reduced somewhat, possibly due in part to the reduced sample size. The primary difference between males and females regarding effects of attitudes is that family values are more important for females than for males. For the first time, a significant effect of work values is observed--positive work values reduce unemployment of males in period 2.

Table 4 displays estimates of the effects of school services and staff attitudes on employment outcomes. Separate regressions were calculated by sex, by student status, and simultaneously by sex and student status. The results were compared to the aggregate estimates. No qualitatively important differences were observed, so the tabulation is for all four groups (male nonstudents, female nonstudents, male students, and female students) combined. Most of the coefficients in table 4 are not statistically significant, but there are nevertheless some encouraging findings. First, job information available at school raises hours worked per week, and, surprisingly, this effect nearly doubles from period 1 to period 2. Utilization of secondary guidance services (e.g., tours of employers, assemblies) improves the wage in period 1 and period 2, though the coefficient in period 2 is not quite significant. Linkage increases hours but decreases wage in period 1. Linkage also decreases unemployment in both periods. None of these coefficients is significant at the conventional .05 level, but the coefficients are

not negligible in magnitude, and probabilities of type I error approach .05 in some instances. Release time given to teachers to contact local employers also increases hours in both time periods, though neither coefficient is quite statistically significant. Emphasizing the teaching goal of inculcating students with good work habits improves the wage in both periods and reduces unemployment in period 1. It increases unemployment in period 2, however, though the coefficient is not significant. Staff emphasis on the importance of job skills and basic skills increases unemployment. These coefficients may be due to feedback effects of unemployment on staff attitudes. Teachers and staff located in areas of high unemployment may be stimulated to believe that both basic and job skills are important in order to give their students an edge in a very competitive job market. Being located in such a labor market probably also increases the unemployment of individuals.

Table 4 goes here

Overall, while some encouraging findings are evident in table 4, the data do not yield an unambiguous endorsement of the effectiveness of a variety of auxiliary services in assisting youth in making the transition from high school to entry-level jobs. The effects of the primary guidance services are particularly disappointing. They are uniformly small, and the signs of the coefficients vary in erratic fashion.

Summary and Conclusions

This paper examines the effects of five types of variables on employment experience in the immediate time periods after leaving high school. The five

types of variables are: deviance in high school, respondent attitudes measured during the senior year in high school, school services, and school staff attitudes on employment experience in the immediate time periods after leaving high school. The deviance variables include absence from school when not sick, tardiness, cutting class, not receiving a high school diploma, discipline problems in school, suspension from school, and having been in "serious trouble with the law." The attitudinal variables consist of work values, family values, community values, self-esteem, and locus of control, all operationalized such that a priori expectation was for favorable impact on employment—on the grounds that adherence to values defined as socially desirable implies a tendency to conform in ways that promote desired labor market outcomes. The staff attitudes include ranking of the importance of developing basic skills, job skills, good work habits, and one item indicating staff belief in the capacity of students to learn. Variables describing school services include placement services, job information, linkage, teacher release time to visit local employers, and utilization of guidance services.

The findings indicate that deviance during high school has small or nonexistent effects on employment experience just after leaving high school. Effect estimates generally are close to zero, but those that are not are nearly as likely to imply that high school deviance generates favorable labor market experience as they are to imply that deviance generates unfavorable experience. Attitudes have stronger effects than deviance. This result was not anticipated. The two types of observation together imply (1) that deviance may be situation specific, and (2) attitudes tend to be enduring by comparison. These generalizations derive from a number of untested assumptions, however. The first is based on the premise that deviance at work does, in fact, lead to unfavorable work experience. Consequently, if high

school deviance carries over into the work setting, one should observe that those who were deviant in high school work fewer hours, earn a lower wage, and are more likely to be unemployed than those who conform to high school norms. The second derives from the assumption that attitudes at work affect work behavior which, in turn, affects labor market success.

The pattern of the effects of the attitudes is curious. Internal locus of control and strong family values lead to favorable labor market outcomes. The effects of family values are stronger for females. Positive self-esteem, however, hinders labor market success, especially for students in post-secondary schools. Work values have almost no effects! The one exception here is that positive work values of males reduce the chance of unemployment. Community values generally have little effect, but there is a tendency for strong sense of community to inhibit success in entry-level jobs. None of the effects of attitudes are strong, however, and many coefficients are not statistically significant.

The lack of effects of school deviance, the small effects of attitudes, and the lack of consistent signs on the coefficients associated with deviance and with attitudes all suggest that employer emphasis on good attitudes and hard work is misplaced. This conclusion must be viewed as tentative, however. First, the low effects of school deviance probably result in part from the inability of employers to use behavioral records as screening devices. It does not mean that deviance on the job has no effect. Secondly, it seems apparent that employers are not able to determine reliably in advance of hiring what attitudes job applicants hold. Therefore, employers cannot screen on attitudes either.

Even if it were possible to screen on attitudes, one would need substantially more evidence than is contained in this paper before deciding to pick

individuals for employment with internal locus of control, low self esteem, and high family values, and to disregard applicants' work values.

The investigation of the effects of school variables also did not uncover any exceptionally strong effects, but some encouraging results are observed. In particular, availability of job information in the high school, linkage between the school and local employers, and release time given to teachers to contact local employers show some tendencies to foster favorable employment experiences for youth who attended schools offering these services. These effects are not strong, however, and exhibit a somewhat erratic pattern of sign changes across outcome measures. The strongest effects are for job information. Counseling services do not show a consistent pattern of helping youth in the transition from school to work.

The implications of these results for school policy regarding employability development of students are difficult to assess. Strong emphasis on good deportment and "responsible" attitudes is not supported by the analyses here, though it is difficult to agree on broader grounds that such emphasis is ill advised. The results do imply that policies designed to provide concrete services such as job information may be helpful, but the statistical results are too weak to engender confidence in this type of policy.

Absence of strong effects of school deportment and attitudes on work outcomes in the years just after leaving high school raise important questions regarding claims of radical critics of schooling such as Bowles and Gintis (1976) or Carnoy and Levin (1976). As we have seen, the HSB data indicate that adherence to school norms and compliant behavior learned in school do not necessarily lead to desirable employment outcomes in the secondary labor market faced by most youth just after leaving high school. These findings hold irrespective of whether a youth is a full-time college student

or not. Yet the position adopted by these critics would seem to imply that such effects are strong, particularly for noncollege youth.

[1]Members of the consortium are as follows:

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education

The Ohio State University

Columbus, OH 43210-1090

The Wisconsin Center for Education Research

The University of Wisconsin-Madison

Madison, WI 53706

The Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance

Stanford University

Stanford, CA 94305

The Center for Educational Policy and Management

The University of Oregon

Eugene, OR 97403

The Center for Social Organization of Schools

Johns Hopkins University

Baltimore, MD 21218

REFERENCES

Andrisani, Paul J. "Internal-External Attitudes, Personal Initiative, and the Labor Market Experience of Black and White Men." Journal of Human Resources 12, no. 3 (1978): 308-325.

Bachman, Jerald G., and O'Malley, Patrick M. "Self-Esteem in Young Men: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Impact of Educational and Occupational Attainment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 35 (1977): 365-380.

Becker, Howard S. Outsiders. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Bowles, Samuel, and Gintis, Herbert. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Campbell, Paul B.; Gardner, John A.; and Seitz, Patricia. Post Secondary Experience of Students with Varying Participation in Secondary Vocation Education. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1982.

D'Amico, Ronald, and Baker, Paula. "The Nature and Consequences of High School Employment." In Pathways to the Future: Volume 4, pp. 1-48. Columbus: Center for Human Resources Research, The Ohio State University, 1984.

DiPrete, Thomas A. Discipline, Order and Student Behavior in American High Schools. Prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics under contract DE-3---78-0208 with the U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Opinion Research Center, November 1981.

Doeringer, Peter, and Piore, Michael J. Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1971.

Edmonds, Ronald E. "Some Schools Work and More Can." Social Policy 9 (March - April 1979): 28-32.

Ellwood, David T. "Teenage Unemployment: Permanent Scars or Temporary Blemishes?" In The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences, edited by Richard B. Freeman and David A. Wise. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

England, Paula. "Assessing Trends in Occupational Sex Segregation, 1900-1976." In Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets, edited by Ivar Berg, pp. 273-292. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Frankel, Martin R.; Kohnke, Luane; Buonanno, David; and Tourangeau, Roger. Sample Design Report: A Report to the National Center for Education Statistics under Contract No. 300-78-0208 by the National Opinion Research Center. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1981.

Freeman, Richard B., and Wise, David A. eds. The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Grasso, John T., and Shea, John R. Vocational Education and Training: Impact on Youth. Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1979.

Hodson, Randy and Robert L. Kaufman, Economic Dualism: A Critical Review. Department of Sociology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712.

Hollenbeck, Kevin, and Smith, Bruce. Selecting Young Workers: The Influence of Applicants' Education and Skills on Employability Assessments by Employers. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1984.

Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth and Elmtown Revisited. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Hotchkiss, Lawrence. Effects of Schooling on Cognitive, Attitudinal, and Behavioral Outcomes. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1984.

Hotchkiss, Lawrence, and Dorsten, Linda Eberst. Attitudes, Behavior, and Employability. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1985.

Hotchkiss, Lawrence, and Kang, Suk. High School Preparation for Employment. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1984.

Jones, Calvin; Knight, Shirley; and Ingels, Steven. "Administrator and Teacher Survey: Final Report." Chicago: University of Chicago, NORC, September 1984.

Kang, Suk. "Time Profile of Youths' Labor Market Outcomes: An Analysis of High School and Beyond Data." In High School Preparation for Employment, pp. 95-141. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1984.

Kang, Suk, and Bishop, John. "Impact of Curriculum on the Non-College Bound Youths' Labor Market Outcomes." In High School Preparation for Employment, pp. 55-94. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1984.

Lester, Richard A. Hiring Practices and Labor Competition. Princeton, NJ: Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, 1954.

Mertens, Donna M., and Gardner, John A. Vocational Education and the Younger Adult Worker. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1981.

Meyer, Robert H., and Wise, David A. "High School Preparation and Early Labor Force Experience." In The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences, edited by R. B. Freeman and D. A. Wise, pp. 277-339. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Mortimer, Jeylan T., and Finch, Michael P. "The Effects of Part-Time Work on Adolescent Self-Concept and Achievement." In Becoming A Worker, edited by Kathryn Borman and Jane Reisman. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, forthcoming.

Osterman, Paul. Getting Started: The Youth Labor Market. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1980.

Rumberger, Russell W., and Daymont, Thomas N. "The Economic Value of Academic and Vocational Training Acquired in High School." Paper presented at the 1982 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Shapiro, David. "Wage Differentials Among Black, Hispanic, and White Young Men." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 37 (4) July 1984.

Stephenson, Stanley P. "In-School Labor Force Status and Post-High School Wage Rates of Young Men." Applied Economics 13, 1981.

Treiman, D. J., and Hartman, Heidi, I., eds. Women, Work and Wages: Equal Pay for Equal Value. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 1981.

Wilms, Wellford W. "The Limited Utility of Vocational Education: California Employers' Views." Public Affairs Report 24 (41) August 1983.

_____. "Vocational Education and Job Success: The Employer's View." Phi Delta Kappa 65, no. 5 (January 1984): 347-350.

Young, Anne McDougall. "Special Labor Force Reports—Summaries." Monthly Labor Review 105. 1982).

TABLE 1

EFFECTS OF SCHOOL DEPORTMENT AND ATTITUDES
ON EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES

	Dependent Variables					
	Period 1			Period 2		
Independent Variables	Hours	Wage	Unemployment	Hours	Wage	Unemployment
Deviance-related measure						
Truancy	-.0101 (-.0028)	.0045 (.0123)	.0172 (.0267)	.0495 (.0136)	.0128 (.0292)	.0032 (.0110)
Tardiness	.0669 (.0208)	.0130* (.0400)	.0021 (.0037)	-.0429 (-.0134)	.0056 (.0146)	.0039 (.0152)
Cut classes	.4105 (.0059)	.0174 (.0035)	.0181 (.0267)	.7774 (-.0007)	-.0026 (.0020)	.0046
High school diploma	.9063 (.0057)	-.1676 (-.0104)	.2469 (.0087)	4.168 (.0259)	.3418 (.0176)	-.4364 (-.0338)
Discipline problems in school	.0390 (.0009)	-.0440 (-.0100)	(-.0354) (-.0046)	.3434 (.0079)	-.0264 (-.0051)	-.0700 (-.0200)
Suspended from school	.2671 (.0058)	.0362 (.0078)	-.0162 (-.0020)	-.0594 (-.0013)	-.0440 (-.0080)	.0792 (.0215)
In serious trouble with the law	-1.409 (-.0170)	.1778 (.0212)	.0242 (.0016)	.3713 (.0046)	.2664 (.0275)	.1466 (.0227)
Attitudes						
Self esteem	-.2224 (-.0115)	-.0526 (-.0269)	.0998 (.0289)	-.6054* (-.0310)	-.0815* (-.0347)	.0410 (.0262)
Locus of control	.3179 (.0146)	.0679* (.0307)	-.1019 (-.0261)	.2300 (.0105)	.0377 (.0144)	-.0848** (-.0486)
Work values	.3933 (.0191)	.0137 (.0066)	-.0363 (-.0099)	.0947 (.0045)	.0111 (.0044)	-.0188 (-.0112)
Family values	.9792** (.0430)	.0148 (.0064)	-.1043 (-.0256)	.8013* (.0350)	.0972* (.0353)	-.0704* (-.0383)
Community values	-.3547 (-.0173)	-.0248 (-.0120)	.1705** (.0465)	-.4347 (-.0209)	-.0801* (-.0321)	.0001 (.0001)
Corrected R-square	.2226	.0563	.0429	.2008	.0689	.0304

NOTES: Standardized coefficients in parentheses. Probabilities are for two-tailed tests:
*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

TABLE 2

EFFECTS OF SCHOOL DEPORTMENT AND ATTITUDES ON EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES BY STUDENT STATUS

	Not a Full-Time Student Dependent Variables					
	Period 1			Period 2		
Independent Variables	Hours	Wage	Unemployment	Hours	Wage	Unemployment
Deviance-related measure						
Truancy	-.0892	.0026	.0326*	-.0244	.0088	-.0012
	(-.0280)	(.0071)	(.0616)	(-.0081)	(.0194)	(-.0050)
Tardiness	.0823	.0046	.0002	-.0205	-.0073	.0096*
	(.0266)	(.0131)	(.0004)	(-.0072)	(-.0168)	(.0440)
Cut classes	.5667	.0350	-.0151	1.4496*	.0796	-.0170
	(.0200)	(.0109)	(-.0032)	(.0546)	(.0198)	(-.0081)
High school diploma	.6515	-.2026	.2334	4.3577	.3125	-.5060*
	(.0060)	(-.0163)	(.0129)	(.0418)	(.0198)	(-.0613)
Discipline problems in school	.0810	.0311	-.0624	-.2024	.1037	-.0067
	(.0021)	(.0071)	(-.0097)	(-.0056)	(.0191)	(-.0024)
Suspended from school	.9504	-.0575	.0510	.2192	-.1658	.1401*
	(.0235)	(-.0125)	(.0076)	(.0058)	(-.0289)	(.0467)
In serious trouble with the law	.5692	.1968	.3026	-1.5033	.2804	.1830
	(.0082)	(.0250)	(.0262)	(-.0235)	(.0299)	(.0362)
Attitudes						
Self-esteem	-.3366	-.0618	-.0028	-.8980*	-.1035	.0029
	(-.0177)	(-.0285)	(-.0009)	(-.0507)	(-.0386)	(.0020)
Locus of control	1.2466	.1521**	-.0232	1.0148*	.141'	-.0818*
	(.0600)**	(.0644)	(-.0067)	(.0528)	(.0486)	(-.0538)
Work values	.3075	.0154	-.0722	-.0136	.0251	-.0330
	(.0159)	(.0070)	(-.0224)	(-.0007)	(.0090)	(-.0225)
Family values	1.3160**	.0584	-.1740	.7716	.1281	-.1078**
	(.0582)	(.0227)	(-.0463)	(.0374)	(.0410)	(-.0661)
Community values	-.2057	-.0490	.0789	-.0256	-.1207	.0055
	(-.0098)	(-.0206)	(.0226)	(-.0013)	(-.0408)	(.0036)
Corrected R-square	.1577	.0666	.0523	.1419	.0640	.0433

TABLE 2 --(Continued)

Independent Variables	Full-Time Student Dependent Variables					
	Period 1			Period 2		
	Hours	Wage	Unemployment	Hours	Wage	Unemployment
Deviance-related measure						
Truancy	.0754 (.0213)	.0074 (.0200)	.0008 (.0010)	.0971 (.0251)	.0186* (.0448)	.0096 (.0274)
Tardiness	.0438 (.0152)	.0165** (.0544)	.0084 (.0137)	-.0405 (-.0132)	.0140 (.0423)	-.0005 (-.0017)
Cut classes	.0486 (.0019)	-.0082 (-.0030)	.0590 (.0107)	-.1441 (-.0052)	-.0819 (-.0274)	.0420 (.0167)
Discipline problems in school	.1174 (.0028)	-.1216 (-.0277)	.0516 (.0058)	1.2981 (.0283)	-.1183 (-.0382)	-.1516 (-.0366)
Suspended from school	-.1851 (-.0041)	.1229 (.0261)	-.0724 (-.0076)	-.7168 (-.0148)	.0924 (.0177)	.0167 (.0038)
In serious trouble with the law	-4.2618*** (-.0501)	.1424 (.0159)	-.3177 (-.0176)	2.9930 (.0339)	.2543 (.0267)	.0847 (.0106)
Attitudes						
Self-esteem	-.2255 (-.0132)	-.0454 (-.0252)	.1621* (.0445)	-.4375 (-.0235)	-.0700 (-.0349)	.0747* (.0443)
Locus of control	-.1796 (-.0087)	.0123 (.0057)	-.1931* (-.0440)	-.3341 (-.0151)	-.0507 (-.0213)	-.0939* (.0469)
Work values	.4598 (.0244)	.0105 (.0053)	-.0168 (-.0042)	.1551 (.0076)	-.0193 (-.0087)	-.0153 (-.0082)
Family values	.5970 (.0298)	-.0147 (-.0070)	-.0733 (-.0172)	.5940 (.0271)	.0754 (.0320)	-.0508 (-.0256)
Community values	-.1407 (-.0079)	.0039 (.0021)	.2039** (.0541)	-.4430 (-.0231)	-.0318 (-.0154)	-.0079 (-.0045)
Corrected R-square	.1133	.0392	.0444	.0996	.0542	.0259

NOTES: Standardized coefficients in parentheses. Probabilities are for two-tailed tests:
*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

TABLE 3

EFFECTS OF SCHOOL DEPORTMENT AND ATTITUDES ON EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES BY GENDER

	Males					
	Dependent Variables					
	Period 1			Period 2		
Independent Variables	Hours	Wage	Unemployment	Hours	Wage	Unemployment
Deviance-related measure						
Truancy	-.0275 (-.0077)	.0011 (.0031)	-.0038 (-.0070)	-.0064 (-.0018)	.0054 (.0122)	.0002 (.0008)
Tardiness	.0486 (.0154)	.0119 (.0363)	.0165 (.0340)	-.0338 (-.0111)	.0145 (.0375)	.0048 (.0211)
Cut classes	.6666 (.0221)	.0940 (.0299)	-.0541 (-.0116)	.2953 (.0099)	.0813 (.0215)	-.0075 (-.0033)
High school diploma	1.4324 (.0095)	-.4482 (-.0286)	.2394 (.0103)	1.0027 (.0069)	.3660 (.0198)	-.2900 (-.0264)
Discipline problems in school	-.2972 (-.0071)	-.1225 (-.0284)	-.0048 (-.0007)	-.3272 (-.0080)	-.0998 (-.0193)	-.0464 (-.0151)
Suspended from school	.2817 (.0066)	.0532 (.0119)	-.0931 (-.0141)	.7913 (.0187)	-.1076 (-.0201)	.1424 (.0447)
In serious trouble with the law	-1.8552 (-.0283)	.1610 (.0236)	.2607 (.0258)	.7229 (.0116)	.2763 (.0350)	.1528 (.0325)
Attitudes						
Self-esteem	-.0650 (-.0031)	-.0848 (-.0385)	.1073 (.0329)	-.6293 (-.0294)	-.0891 (-.0328)	.0618 (.0383)
Locus of control	.1914 (.0083)	.0418 (.0175)	-.1082 (-.0305)	.4353 (.0196)	.0905 (.0321)	-.1023* (-.0610)
Work values	.4379 (.0189)	.0338 (.0140)	-.1401 (-.0392)	.5159 (.0223)	.0299 (.0102)	-.1003* (-.0575)
Family values	.8684 (.0362)	-.0296 (-.0118)	-.0597 (.0161)	.9516 (.0397)	.0566 (.0186)	-.0346 (-.0191)
Community values	-.5991 (-.0291)	-.0361 (-.0168)	.1862* (.0586)	-.7438 (-.0361)	-.0975 (-.0374)	-.0076 (-.0049)
Corrected R-square	.2395	.0407	.0290	.2140	.0666	.0250

TABLE 3--(Continued)

	Females Dependent Variables					
	Period 1			Period 2		
Independent Variables	Hours	Wage	Unemployment	Hours	Wage	Unemployment
Deviance-related measure						
Truancy	.0119 (.0034)	.0094 (.0271)	.0418** (.0575)	.1044 (.0285)	.0220* (.0526)	.0065 (.0205)
Tardiness	.0857 (.0271)	.0127 (.0410)	-.0138 (-.0212)	-.0369 (-.0114)	-.0057 (-.0156)	.0027 (.0097)
Cut classes	.1685 (.0062)	-.0431 (-.0162)	.0936 (.0168)	1.1459 (.0414)	-.0678 (-.0214)	.0162 (.0067)
High school diploma	.7491 (.0046)	.2103 (.0131)	.1939 (.0058)	9.510** (.0547)	.3408 (.0172)	-.6363* (-.0420)
Discipline problems in school	.2956 (.0067)	.0209 (.0048)	-.0677 (-.0075)	1.0485 (.0232)	.0402 (.0078)	-.0836 (-.0212)
Suspended from school	.2276 (.0047)	.0218 (.0046)	.1286 (.0129)	-1.0369 (-.0210)	.0519 (.0092)	-.0090 (-.0021)
In serious trouble with the law	-.9989 (-.0078)	.0111 (.0009)	-.7406 (-.0280)	-1.3709 (-.0107)	-.0981 (-.0067)	.1355 (.0121)
Attitudes						
Self-esteem	-.3320 (-.0192)	-.0331 (-.0195)	.0964 (.0270)	-.5661 (-.0323)	-.0748 (-.0374)	.0298 (.0195)
Locus of control	.3597 (.0178)	.0882* (.0445)	-.0655 (-.0158)	-.0167 (-.0008)	.0004 (.0002)	-.0614 (-.0340)
Work values	.2315 (.0127)	-.0230 (-.0128)	.0344 (.0092)	-.2481 (-.0130)	-.0432 (-.0198)	.0320 (.0193)
Family values	1.0489** (.0498)	.0478 (.0231)	-.1086 (-.0251)	.5772 (.0270)	.1349** (.0554)	-.0856* (-.0461)
Community values	-.1157 (-.0059)	.0049 (.0025)	.1571 (.0387)	-.1349 (-.0067)	-.0354 (-.0154)	.0081 (.0046)
Corrected R-squared	.1551	.0167	.0420	.1249	.0261	.0298

NOTES: Standardized coefficients in parentheses. Probabilities are for two-tailed tests: *** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

TABLE 4

EFFECTS OF SCHOOL VARIABLES ON EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES

	Dependent Variables					
	Period 1			Period 2		
Independent Variables	Hours	Wage	Unemployment	Hours	Wage	Unemployment
Importance of good work habits	.6237 (.0333)	.1223* (.0647)	-.1658 (-.0461)	.2422 (.0128)	.0841 (.0377)	.0389 (.0250)
Importance of job skills	-.2462 (-.0120)	.0451 (.0217)	.2286* (.0579)	-.1459 (-.0070)	.0525 (.0213)	.0558 (.0326)
Importance of basic skills	-.1684 (-.0085)	.0078 (.0039)	.2524* (.0663)	.1230 (.0061)	-.0654 (-.0274)	.0662 (.0399)
Ability rating of students by staff	-.5324 (-.0162)	-.0377 (-.0114)	.1043 (.0166)	-1.0061 (-.0299)	-.0363 (-.0091)	.0640 (.0231)
Release time	.0062 (.0452)	-.0002 (-.0165)	-.0007 (-.0257)	.0033 (.0249)	-.0002 (-.0157)	.0001 (.0104)
"Linkage"	1.3470 (.0388)	-.1617 (-.0462)	-.2734 (-.0410)	.0072 (.0002)	-.0454 (-.0110)	-.0574 (-.0200)
Placement service	-.4335 (-.0169)	-.0802 (-.0309)	.1122 (.0228)	-.2715 (-.0104)	-.1192 (-.0387)	-.0006 (-.0003)
Job information	2.5491* (.0478)	-.2301 (-.0428)	-.3770 (-.0368)	4.3464** (.0799)	-.0154 (-.0024)	-.1756 (-.0394)
Primary guidance service	-.0015 (-.0223)	-.0001 (-.0162)	-.0003 (-.0248)	-.0012 (-.0180)	.0001 (.0175)	.00005 (.0083)
Secondary guidance service	-.0058 (-.0367)	.0009* (.0591)	.0008 (.0282)	-.0037 (-.0225)	.0007 (.0386)	-.0003 (-.0191)
Corrected R-square	.2405	.0718	.0723	.2303	.0758	.0398

NOTES: Standardized coefficients in parentheses. Probabilities are for two-tailed tests:
*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$